

**MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY APRIL 11, 2018**

1. THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 12:05 PM

Present: Jesse Garlick (Chair); Elizabeth Balderston; Sorin Birliga; Justin Gammon; Deborah LeFrank; Jason Niles; Carl-Jan Rupp; Stefan Schulson

Absent for a Portion of the Meeting: Paul Hammond

Staff Present: Miko Betanzo – Senior Planner, Urban Design
Alec Johnston – Senior Planner
Michael Angrove – Planner
Katie Lauriston – Secretary

2. MINUTES

Minutes from the Meeting held February 28, 2018

Motion:

It was moved by Deborah LeFrank, seconded by Paul Hammond, that the Minutes of the Meeting of Advisory Design Panel held February 28, 2018 be adopted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

Paul Hammond recused himself from Rezoning Application No. 00620 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00076 for 210 Gorge Road East.

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1 Rezoning Application No. 00620 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00076 for 210 Gorge Road East

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow for the development of a six-storey, multi-unit residential building consisting of rental dwelling units and supportive housing dwelling units.

Applicant meeting attendees:

KATHY STINSON
BARRY COSGRAVE
BRAD FORTH

THE VICTORIA COOL AID SOCIETY
NUMBER TEN ARCHITECTURAL GROUP
FORSITE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Mr. Betanzo provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- building height
- corner treatment of the building at Gorge Road East and Carroll Street
- treatment of blank walls on the east elevation
- building mass along the upper storeys
- application of materials on the building.

Kathy Stinson provided the Panel with an overview of the Victoria Cool Aid Society, Mr. Anthony provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal and Brad Forth provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- what is the design rationale for limiting the glazing on the east elevation?
 - this was a response to overlook concerns from the neighbours to the east
 - the proposal is set back as far as possible, so the windows are set back about 45 ft. and all other windows are turned back or into the courtyard
- were high windows considered?
 - the interior planning is still preliminary, but this would be a possibility
- does the neighbour to the east have windows looking towards the proposal?
 - yes, there are a series of units with windows oriented towards the proposal
 - there are very few windows facing the proposal on the building to the north
- are the renderings accurate illustrating less glazing on the main floor street level?
 - this is incorrect in the renderings but accurate on the floor plan; there will be windows into the mechanical/maintenance room and a glazed door on the first floor
 - the entry corner is glazed all the way around, except for the solid portion at the washroom location
- what is the presence of the mechanical/electrical room at Gorge Road East?
 - it is buried to the east, with only the maintenance office visible
- why is the massing broken down vertically into three distinct sections?
 - guidelines recommend 4-storey commercial along Gorge Road East, and staff have requested a subtler transition to the 6th floor
- was it considered to turn the gravel roof on the east side into a green roof or accessible space?
 - this was discussed, but there were maintenance and security concerns associated with access and green rooves technically presented a bigger issue to the owners
- is the gazebo in the patio area open to both sides?
 - no, it is only open to the patio
- were CPTED concerns around the gazebo placement considered?
 - the patio is a secured area with access only from inside, and the gazebo is only for residents' use
- is the egress area off Carroll Street a patio space or just for parking?
 - this space is for four visitor parking stalls for staff and visitors
- the site plan shows parking to the north; does the landscaping go right up to the building?
 - the underground parking is underneath the surface planting
- how tall is the building to the east?
 - 3 storeys

- was glazing considered at the top floor?
 - yes, the 6th floor is stepped back quite a bit but the proposal is still close to the south and to the north
 - part of the top floor obscures the rooftop mechanical structures
- could more glazing be added on the east elevation?
 - the applicant is hesitant to propose new windows facing the neighbours to the east, although higher windows could be considered on the east elevation at the 5th and 6th floors.

Panel members discussed:

- appreciation for the attention to detail translated into design, and the experience of the proposal in the public realm
- appreciation for the articulation of the façade, as well as the proposal's movement and massing
- the desire for high bedroom windows or glazing to mitigate concerns for the blank wall to the east
- the opportunity to shift the gazebo placement to eliminate CPTED concerns arising from a blind corner
- no concerns regarding the height and transition to the buildings to the north, as they do not have windows facing the proposal
- opportunity to accentuate the corner with increased landscaping to mitigate staff concern for the corner height
- desire to see 6th floor visually integrated into the lower floors by avoiding the introduction of new materials and massing, particularly on the east elevation
- the choice of materials being a bit heavy overall
- opportunity to make changes to benefit residents instead of working to avoid offending neighbours
- private amenity spaces could be improved by bringing them to the level of public-facing spaces
- desire for access and/or landscaping on the roof of the southeast corner mechanical and electrical room
- opportunity for the courtyard to be a real amenity space rather than bringing parking noise up to some residents
- opportunity to soften parking entrance from Carroll Street with a median or surface treatment
- desire to increase prominence of the front entryway from the street
- desire to break up the surface treatment of the parking entrance or to have the gate placement further back to encourage activity.

Motion:

It was moved by Justin Gammon, seconded by Jesse Garlick, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00620 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000076 for 210 Gorge Road East be approved with the following considerations:

- Explore opportunities to introduce glazing on the east façade
- Review gazebo placement to eliminate CPTED concerns
- Consider access and/or landscaping opportunities on the southeast corner mechanical and electrical room roof

- Consider enhancing the parkade and pedestrian entrance treatments and increasing the prominence of the front entrance.

Carried Unanimously

Paul Hammond returned to the meeting at 1:05pm.

3.2 Rezoning Application No. 00613 and Development Permit No. 000516 for 829-899 Fort Street and 846-856 Broughton Street

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow for a ten-storey mixed-use building containing independent seniors' rental apartment units, market rental apartment units, commercial offices, a childcare facility, music school and retail commercial uses on the ground floor.

Applicant meeting attendees:

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| HELEN BESHARAT | BESHARAT FRIARS ARCHITECTS |
| RAINER MILLER | PARC RETIREMENT LIVING |
| RUSSELL HUBBS | PARC RETIREMENT LIVING |
| PATRICK SCHILLING | PARC RETIREMENT LIVING |
| RICK MARZOLF | MARZOLF & ASSOCIATES |
| JULIE MARZOLF | MARZOLF & ASSOCIATES |
| ROB WALTER | AME GROUP |
| SIMON BUTTON | BUNT & ASSOCIATES |
| SCOTT WILLIAMS | MORRISON HERSHFIELD CORP. |
| LORNE GAVINCHUK | 30-60-90 CONSTRUCTION |

Mr. Johnston provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- the scale and massing as they relate to the step back policy
- the street level design
- building differentiation
- the rooftop mechanical rooms and height.

Helen Besharat and Rainer Miller provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- were other design scenarios for the window treatments explored?
 - there have been many design iterations; the proposal emphasizes a 2-3 storey building at streetscape, with the rest of the façade having a dignified, well-detailed brick
 - triple-glazed windows with taller proportions to achieve a good proportion of window to wall
- in the bridge component, are the horizontal windows designed as punch windows?
 - no, they will be spandrel glass in a horizontal pattern
- are the sills in pre-cast concrete?
 - yes, and they have changed to the buff colour and warm brick colour as a result of immediate neighbour feedback